

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA  
VALDOSTA DIVISION**

**RECKO ELLIS,**

**Plaintiff,**

**VS.**

**PAM FLETCHER,**

**Defendant.**

:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:

**CIVIL ACTION FILE  
NO. 7:06-CV-129 (HL)**

---

**RECOMMENDATION**

This recommendation will in large part be essentially identical to that entered by the undersigned on October 16, 2007, in case number 7:06-cv-127 which is styled Ellis v. Peete, and on October 17, 2007, in case number 7:06-cv-128 which is styled Ellis v. Peete, et al. Certain of the dates and record number references may vary. Presently pending herein are Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment (R. at 18), his Motion Granting Judgment (R. at 19) and his Motion seeking entry of Summary Judgment (R. at 22). For the reasons set out below, the undersigned **RECOMMENDS** that each of plaintiff's motions be **DENIED**.

On July 13, 2007, plaintiff filed a motion for summary judgment which states in its entirety, "[c]omes now where the plaintiff is requesting for this court to render a summary judgment in this case." On August 13, 2007, plaintiff filed an affidavit in which he swears that everything he has stated is true (R. at 19).

Plaintiff's motion and supporting documents are so improper and inadequate that it does not even merit a response from the defendant who did not respond. On October 12, 2007, plaintiff filed his Motion Granting Judgment, in which he seeks summary judgment predicated upon defendant's failure to respond to his summary judgment motion. Then on October 15,

2007, plaintiff who must be considered a recreational filer<sup>1</sup> files yet another motion wherein he asks the court to grant his motion for summary judgment.

Due to the complete inadequacy of plaintiff's motion for summary judgment it must be denied. He has most certainly failed to show that he is entitled to a judgment in his favor. If that motion is denied, the remaining two motions must also be denied as moot.

Further, it does not appear that the plaintiff has complied with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5(d) by attaching a proper certificate of service to any of the three motions showing service on the defendant or his counsel. It is therefore **RECOMMENDED** that each motion referred to herein be **DENIED**. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), the parties may file written objections to this recommendation with the Honorable Hugh Lawson, Chief United States District Judge, WITHIN TEN (10) DAYS of receipt thereof.

**SO RECOMMENDED**, this 22<sup>nd</sup> day of October 2007.

/s/ **Richard L. Hodge**  
RICHARD L. HODGE  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

---

<sup>1</sup>Eighteen lawsuits filed in this court since December 21, 2006.